REMARKS

[0002]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 3-6, 8-18, 20-23 and 26 are currently pending

- Claims 2, 7, 19, 24 and 25 are canceled herein

- Claims 1, 6, 16, 21 and 26 are amended herein

- No new claims are added herein

[0003]   Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 26 is found in the specification at least at p. 10 lines 19-20 and p. 11 lines 9-13.

[0004]   Claim 1 is amended to include subject matter from dependent claim 2. Claim 6 is amended to include subject matter from dependent claim 7. Claim 16 is amended to include subject matter from dependent claim 19. Claim 21 is amended to include subject matter from dependent claims 24 and 25.

Claims 16-20 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101

[0005]   Claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0006]   Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without commenting on the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claim

Serial No.: 10/717,830   -12-   lee◆hayes The Business of IP®
Atty Docket No.: MS1-4172US
Atty/Agent: Kasey C. Christie
                                                                      www.leehayes.com ◆ 800.324.9256

16 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 101 rejection moot.

Cited Documents

[0007]   The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Zintel**: Zintel, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020029256

- **Slaughter**: Slaughter, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,643,650

- **Saint**: Saint-Hilaire, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030101294

Zintel Fails to Anticipate Claims 1-6 and 26

[0008]   Claims 1-6 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Zintel*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0009]   Applicant submits that the Office has not shown that Zintel anticipates this claim. Zintel does not disclose at least the following features of amended claim 1 (with emphasis added):

- wherein the one or more services comprise an information service, **the information service being configured to produce a customizable tag-based document that holds events which have been generated by the one or more services but not yet consumed by an application service, and further wherein the customizable tag-based document holds the state the one or more services.**

[0010] Amended claim 1 recites in part, "the information service being configured to produce a customizable tag-based document that holds events which have been generated by the one or more services but not yet consumed by an application service, and further wherein the customizable tag-based document holds the state the one or more services." Nowhere does Zintel disclose, teach or suggest, "a customizable tag-based document...holds events which have been generated by one or more services but not yet consumed by an application service....holds the state of one or more services," as claim 1 recites.

[0011] Consequently, Zintel does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Zintel does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-5

[0012] Claim 2 is canceled herein, rending the rejection of claim 2 moot. Claims 3-5 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited documents, and is therefore allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 3-5 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 6

[0013]   Applicant submits that the Office has not shown that Zintel anticipates this claim. Zintel does not disclose at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- a display service with a port identifiable by an identifier that includes **a cursor shape service for describing the shape of an on-screen cursor,**

[0014]   Amended claim 6 recites in part, "a cursor shape service for describing the shape of an on-screen cursor." This portion of amended claim 6 is incorporated from dependent claim 7. The Office states, with regards to incorporated claim 7, "Zintel does not specifically disclose a cursor shape service. However, Saint teaches a display service includes (sic) a cursor shape service for describing the shape on an on-screen cursor [paragraph 0144-0146 of Saint]". (Office Action, page 9.) Saint describes, "a lightweight remote input service", (Saint, paragraph 144).

[0015]   It seems that the Office is equating the "cursor shape service" of amended claim 6 with the, "devices…can be build using various types of input, from no input at al to pen-input, keyboard, mouse and button input. Each type of input generally be handled by a respective input service, wherein the existence and capabilities of each input service will be described in that service's UPnP description information. This information may include type of input device, commands supported (buttons, positions, e.g. , pen, mouse position in XY coordinates, clicks, z-axis position etc.)." (Saint, paragraph 145). However, nowhere does Saint disclose, teach or suggest the use of a

"cursor shape service for describing the shape of an on-screen cursor," as amended claim 6 recites.

[0016]   Consequently, Zintel does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim.   Accordingly, Applicant submits that Zintel does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 7-15

[0017]   Claim 7 is canceled herein, rendering the rejection of claim 7 moot. Claims 8-15 ultimately depend from independent claim 6.   As discussed above, claim 6 is not anticipated by the cited documents, and is therefore allowable over the cited documents.   Therefore, claims 8-15 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim.   These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 26

[0018]   Applicant submits that the Office has not shown that Zintel anticipates this claim. Zintel does not disclose at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- wherein the one or more services comprise an information service, **the information service being configured to produce customizable tag-based messages that hold events which have been generated by the one or more services but not yet consumed by an application service, and   further**

wherein the customizable tag-based messages hold the state the one or more services.

[0019] Amended claim 26 recites in part, "the information service being configured to produce customizable tag-based messages that hold events which have been generated by the one or more services but not yet consumed by an application service, and further wherein the customizable tag-based messages hold the state the one or more services." Nowhere does Zintel disclose, teach or suggest, "customizable tag-based messages...hold events which have been generated by one or more services but not yet consumed by an application service....hold the state of one or more services," as claim 26 recites.

[0020] Consequently, Zintel does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Zintel does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Claims *16 and 21* Are Non-Obvious Over *Zintel in view of Slaughter*

[0021] Claims *16 and 21* stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Zintel in view of Slaughter*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 16

[0022] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 16 is obvious in view of the combination of Zintel and Slaughter. Applicant submits that the combination of Zintel and Slaughter does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- requesting the service to change a cursor shape, **the act of requesting invoking a cursor shape service that changes the shape of the cursor;**

[0023]   Amended claim 16 recites in part, "requesting the service to change a cursor shape, the act of requesting invoking a cursor shape service that changes the shape of the cursor." This portion of amended claim 16 is incorporated from dependent claim 19. The Office states, with regards to incorporated claim 19, "Zintel as modified teaches requesting the service to change a cursor shape, the act of requesting invoking a cursor shape service that changes the shape of the cursor [paragraph 0155 of Saint]." (Office Action, page 12).   Saint describes, "the three pointer primitives –MouseDown, MouseMove, and MouseUp." (Saint, paragraphs [0152-0154]).

[0024]   It appears the Office is equating the "cursor shape service that changes the shape of the cursor," as recited in amended claim 16, with the movements of Saint. However, Saint goes on to teach that, "during input service discovery, the extended PC is informed of the maximum values of x and y. If the device has a display, these pointer primitives may have a different resolution that may not match the x and y of the display. In such instances, software residing on the extended PC may be used to scale the pointer position to the display." (Saint, paragraph [0155]). Scaling the pointer position to the display, as suggested by Saint, is not the same as "chang(ing the shape of a cursor," as claim 16 recites.

[0025]   Consequently, the combination of Zintel and Slaughter does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim.   Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 17-20

[0026]   Claim 19 is canceled herein, rending the rejection of claim 19 moot. Claims 17, 18 and 20 ultimately depend from independent claim 16. As discussed above, claim 16 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 17, 18 and 20 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 21

[0027]   Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 21 is obvious in view of the combination of Zintel and Slaughter. Applicant submits that the combination of Zintel and Slaughter does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- requesting the service to change a cursor shape, **the act of requesting invoking a cursor shape service that changes the shape of the cursor;**

[0028]   Amended claim 21 recites in part, "a cursor shape service that changes the shape of the cursor." This portion of amended claim 21 is incorporated from dependent claim 24. The Office states that, "as to claims 22-25, these are product claims that correspond to method claims 17-20; see the rejections to claims 17-20. " (Office Action, page 13). The Office goes on to cite Saint, paragraph [0155] as teaching this element.

Serial No.: 10/717,830
Atty Docket No.: MS1-4172US
Atty/Agent: Kasey C. Christie
-19-
lee&hayes The Business of IP®
www.leehayes.com • 500 324 9256

(Office Action, page 12, see corresponding claim 19). Saint describes, "the three pointer primitives – MouseDown, MouseMove, and MouseUp." (Saint, paragraphs [0152-0154]).

[0029] It appears the Office is equating the "cursor shape service that changes the shape of the cursor," as recited in amended claim 21, with the movements of Saint. However, Saint goes on to teach that, "during input service discovery, the extended PC is informed of the maximum values of x and y. If the device has a display, these pointer primitives may have a different resolution that may not match the x and y of the display. In such instances, software residing on the extended PC may be used to scale the pointer position to the display." (Saint, paragraph [0155]). Scaling the pointer position to the display, as suggested by Saint, is not the same as "chang(ing the shape of a cursor," as claim 21 recites.

[0030] Consequently, the combination of Zintel and Slaughter does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 22-25

[0031] Claims 24 and 25 are canceled herein rending the rejection of claims 24 and 25 moot. Claims 22-23 ultimately depend from independent claim 21. As discussed above, claim 21 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 22-23 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims *7-12 and 14* Are Non-Obvious Over *Zintel in view of Saint*

[0032] Claims *7-12 and 14* stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Zintel in view of Saint*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claims 7-12 and 14

[0033] Claim 7 is canceled herein, rending the rejection of claim 7 moot. Claims 8-12 and 14 ultimately depend from independent claim 6. As discussed above, claim 6 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 8-12 and 14 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims *17-20 and 22-25* Are Non-Obvious Over *Zintel and Slaughter further in view of Saint*

[0034] Claims *17-20 and 22-25* stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Zintel and Slaughter further in view of Saint. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claims 17-20

[0035] Claim 19 is canceled herein, rending rejection of claim 19 moot. Claims 17, 18 and 20 ultimately depend from independent claim 16. As discussed above, claim 16 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 17, 18 and 20 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent Claims 22-25

[0036] Claims 24 and 25 are canceled herein, rending the rejection of claims 24 and 25 moot. Claims 22 and 23 ultimately depend from independent claim 21. As discussed above, claim 21 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 22 and 23 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims 13 and 15 Are Non-Obvious Over Zintel and Saint further in view of Slaughter

[0037] Claims *13 and 15* stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Zintel and Saint further in view of Slaughter*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claims 13 and 15

[0038] Claims 13 and 15 ultimately depend from independent claim 6. As discussed above, claim 6 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 13 and 15 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0039]   Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

  /Kayla D. Brant #46,576/_____   Dated:_____July 29, 2009_____

For: Kasey C. Christie
(kasey@leehayes.com; 509-944-4732)
Registration No. 40559